



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## WASTE IN EXTERNAL TRADE IN GENERAL AND WITH THE ORIENT IN PARTICULAR

---

BY JOHN P. YOUNG,

Editor, San Francisco "Chronicle;" author of "Protection and Progress," etc.

---

Something over a half a century ago a noted English economist called attention to the possibility of a relatively early exhaustion of the world's supply of coal. His warning, however, was treated with neglect when it was not pooh-poohed by half-baked geologists, who endeavored to demonstrate that the measures of mineral fuel were practically inexhaustible. It is not extraordinary that the suggestion should have been coldly received, for at the time he wrote the minds of men had been turned topsy turvy by the preposterous and since discredited doctrines of the Manchester school, which elevated trade above production and assumed that the wasteful process of unnecessarily moving things to and fro would benefit mankind.

Ten years ago the writer attempted to revive or create an interest in the neglected subject of conservation by taking the ground that the chief benefit conferred by a resort to a protective tariff was not that upon which most stress was laid, but rather its tendency to conserve resources which when once dissipated cannot be replaced, and for which no substitutes can be found that we may hope will even remotely approach the cheapness of those we are now deliberately wasting.

The concluding sentences of an extended discussion of the subject epitomized the view of the writer which the passage of time is constantly strengthening. They ran: "Cobdenism has this inherent defect, that it considers the exchange of commodities as more important than their production. The aim of protection is to promote production and to avoid waste, therefore it is the economic policy that must endure."

I see no reason for modifying the opinion elaborated throughout the discussion, that external trade is a source of tremendous waste, and that many illusions we have respecting the benefits of transportation will have to be dismissed if we desire to promote a rational economy which will tend to conserve the world's resources.

If general neglect had caused me to question the soundness of the views expressed in several chapters devoted to illustrating waste in transportation, recent events would have confirmed them. Almost imperceptibly there has grown up within the past few years a body of opinion which amply supports the theory advanced that unnecessary external trade is uneconomic.

When President Roosevelt called the governors of the various states of the Union to confer with him and other thoughtful men concerning the desirability of adopting measures to conserve the natural resources, the wisdom of such a course was promptly acknowledged. It is doubtful, however, whether some of those who have been most strenuous in demanding conservation have given much thought to the accomplishment of that result.

The arbitrary setting aside of large tracts of land now covered with timber is a step in the right direction, and the tentative efforts of the government to retain such mineral fuel deposits as have not been appropriated by private individuals is another. But they are very short steps and do not go to the root of the problem, whose proper solution does not demand the prevention of use, but imperatively calls for the elimination of wastefulness.

It must be obvious to the dullest understanding that no real remedy is effected by arbitrarily depriving the present generation of adequate supplies of timber or mineral fuel. There is no good reason why we of the twentieth century should deny ourselves so that those of the twenty-first may have plenty. In the case of our forests it may be necessary in order to insure the continued fertility of the land to see that it is not denuded of vegetation, but it is preposterous to claim that our obligation to posterity demands that we should place obstacles in the way of the utilization of ripe timber. It would be equally absurd to lock up and prevent the appropriation for present uses of iron ores, coal and fuel oil.

But while we may not morally nor economically be obligated to practice self-denial in the use of natural resources when their utilization is in response to real needs of the present, there is absolutely no excuse for wasting them, and sound public policy demands that the industrial system of a country, and, so far as may be practicable, that of the whole world, shall be so shaped that waste will be reduced to a minimum.

Especially is this demanded in dealing with our deposits of iron

and mineral fuel, which may be regarded as practically irreplaceable. It is conceivable that energetic measures might restore the fertility of a country by reforestation, but no one has suggested that the iron ore, the coal and the petroleum once removed from the bowels of the earth and consumed by man can be replaced.

Visionaries see in the utilization of the world's water courses a source of energy which may prove a substitute for that generated by coal and oil fuel, but it is ominous that concurrent with the development of electric energy the consumption of coal and oil proceeds at an accelerated pace. Thus far the use of electricity has made no impression upon the demand for mineral fuels, whose output increases at an enormous rate and out of all proportion to the growth of population.

We must dismiss as unworthy, of consideration the speculations of those who believe and predict that when our supplies of iron and mineral fuel are exhausted substitutes will be discovered for them. As a practical people we must deal with the problem as it presents itself at present, and not put trust in the vagaries of those who assume that the future will take care of itself.

As a matter of fact, the problem is essentially one of the present. It is not a question of how posterity will be affected by the wasting of the earth's natural resources; it is an impending question, as is evidenced by the fact that despite the tremendously increased output of coal and iron they are becoming dearer and must continue to do so until practical methods of abating the demand for them can be found.

Some of those in attendance at the White House conference, notably Andrew Carnegie, evidently perceived that this is the case. Mr. Carnegie instanced the substitution of cement for steel in the construction of bridges; but thus far diligent study of the papers read or printed fails to disclose any suggestion that we may be artificially creating uses for iron and fuel which a resort to rational ideas and practices would render unnecessary.

There is little room for doubt that the modern theory that indiscriminate trading is a benefit to mankind is responsible for a tremendous amount of wastefulness. It has created the condition of mind which we are now laboriously striving to supplant. It has caused "economists" to regard as praiseworthy the rapid dissipation of natural resources. There is scarcely a writer of note who, in the

discussion of economic resources, does not assume that large outputs of irreplaceable resources are beneficial, without once asking whether they fill a real need or whether their temporary present abundance may not cause a dearth in the near future.

Take Great Britain as an example. The economic history of that country is the story of an eager effort to exhaust its irreplaceable deposits of iron and coal. For nearly a century it has been vigorously exploiting its coal and iron mines and exchanging their products for articles of luxury and foodstuffs. Professional economists have applauded her course, first finding in the rapid growth of population proof of the soundness of the forcing out policy and afterward, when the pressure for subsistence became a problem, justifying its continuance on the ground of necessity.

During all this period the British have been continuously exporting coal and iron to countries infinitely better provided with resources of that character than Great Britain. In 1907 the exports of coal, coke and manufactured fuel from the United Kingdom amounted to 66,063,258 tons, and an additional quantity of 18,618,828 tons was shipped as bunker coal for the use of steamships chiefly engaged in the work of helping the British to get rid of their fuel resources. In addition to this direct exportation of mineral fuel a large part of the remaining 183,000,000 tons retained for domestic consumption was consumed in creating energy for factories whose products are often shipped to countries nearer the supplies of raw material and with ampler fuel resources than Great Britain.

Despite the optimistic view of the professional economists and the absurd calculations of the geologists, the fruits of this suicidal course are already exhibiting themselves in the increasing price of coal and a corresponding increase in the cost of manufacturing in the United Kingdom. Even while the defenders of the wasteful system of presently profiting by the inconsiderate use of coal are arguing that the measures of the kingdom will last for hundreds of years, governments are compelled to recognize the menace of increasing prices and reluctantly consent to taxation measures designed to lessen exportation.

As in the case of coal, no regard has been paid by the British to the danger involved in the encroachment upon their store of iron ores. The assumption has been that when they were exhausted it would be possible to obtain supplies from other lands. This has

been done for several years, until now a large proportion of all the iron and steel manufactured in the United Kingdom is produced from ores derived from Spain and other countries. The consequences are visible in the increasing difficulty experienced by the British in maintaining their position in the industry. The troubles that now confront them, however, will seem insignificant when the time comes, as it surely will, when nations shall attempt to conserve their resources by following the example set by Great Britain when she placed an export duty on coal.

It ought not to need much argument to demonstrate that it is uneconomic to pursue such a course as that outlined in the preceding comment. Even if Great Britain could implicitly depend on unfailing supplies of coal and iron from other countries when her own measures are exhausted, or can no longer be profitably worked, it must be obvious that it is wasteful to export, in one form or another, perhaps 100,000,000 tons of coal annually, if at some future time she will be compelled to import coal from other parts of the world.

But we need not go abroad for awful examples. We are beginning to find them at our own door. If this were not the case we should not hear of conferences being called to consider the conservation of the natural resources. If the tremendous and constantly increasing consumption of coal and iron in the United States was not causing alarm, we should not have been afforded an exhibition of wise men in council studying and suggesting methods of preventing wastefulness.

It is doubtful, however, whether these conferences will accomplish more than to direct attention to the subject, for those who attend them persist in approaching the matter from the standpoint of economists, who think the prosperity of a nation is dependent on the multiplication of middlemen, and whose teachings inevitably tend to create the impression that trade is of more importance than production. This state of mind is reflected in the importance attached to transportation facilities, and the refusal to consider that a vast quantity of the hauling to and fro which is constantly in progress is positively wasteful.

When the benefits of facile transportation are abstractly considered the claims made for it seem to be warranted, but when we turn our attention to what is being done by shrewd men, such as

those who administer the affairs of the Standard Oil Company, we speedily discover that when unregulated its tendency is toward wastefulness. The organization referred to finds it expedient to prohibit the shipping of its products from points other than those nearest the seat of consumption. It forbids patrons in Missouri selling to consumers in Ohio oils produced in Pennsylvania. The establishment of zones of this sort is undoubtedly in restraint of trade, but it unquestionably prevents waste, for obviously it is wasteful to ship oils from Pennsylvania to St. Louis and then reship them eastward to points hundreds of miles nearer to the field of production.

It may seem radical to propose that government should deal with an economic problem just as sagacious business men would, and it is not likely that such a proposition will be acted upon until necessity enforces such action. But the time will come, sooner or later, and much sooner than most of us expect, when a complete reversal of the present uneconomic policy, which is fostered by the provision of the federal constitution, that forbids the collection of export duties, will be demanded by the nation.

To urge such a probability at a time when an insistent demand for a revision of the tariff comes from a quarter which has hitherto enjoyed the benefits of the protective system may seem absurd to some, but it is infinitely more absurd to hold conferences to study means of conserving the natural resources and almost in the same breath clamorously demand the adoption of a policy which must inevitably result in their depletion by wasteful methods.

The demand for revision, which has the support of a large section of the manufacturing interests of the country, is largely based on the supposition that it will increase our markets abroad. The same elements which favor the conclusion of reciprocity treaties demand revision, and their objective is the extension of our foreign markets. In every instance of which we have knowledge the treaties made for reciprocal trading, when they result in its increase, have been at the expense of true economy. Their invariable effect is to cause waste in transportation and to stimulate still further the effort to get rid of the natural resources.

Entertaining these views, I am impelled to urge that in considering "our tariff relations with the Orient, actual and desirable," the subject should be approached not from the standpoint of the manu-

facturer, who pertinaciously demands the right to profit at the expense of the nation by getting rid of its irreplaceable resources as rapidly as possible, but from that of the man who takes some thought of the future and who realizes that nations, no more than the foolish virgins of the Scriptures, who wastefully consumed their oil, can escape the penalty of such folly.

When the literature on the subject of the extension of our trade with the Orient is examined the discovery is made that the optimists base their opinion of its future greatness on our ability to supply the Orientals with manufactured articles, into whose production the raw materials whose rapid consumption is causing alarm will enter in large quantities. Only the uninformed imagine the possibility of our becoming exporters on a considerable scale to Eastern countries of the products of the soil. The thrift of the Asiatic and our own future necessities make such an assumption seem irrational.

In the event of an Asiatic development on the scale which some predict, and many believe probable, the demand from Western countries will be chiefly for manufactured articles. In the nature of things it cannot continue for a long period, for if the movement toward the adoption of the habits of the West becomes a dominant factor in the development of Eastern Asia, it will result in the creation of formidable competitors, as the Asiatics, in spite of their backwardness, are a very capable people as the recent progress of Japan conclusively demonstrates.

The probabilities favor the belief that the Oriental nations in their awakening, and while they are building themselves up, will make immense demands upon our irreplaceable resources. Some idea of the extent of the demand may be gained from the statement made that the United States Steel Corporation is negotiating with Russia one of the largest steel-rail contracts ever made. If the contract is concluded, the corporation will supply over a million tons of steel rails for retracking the Siberian road. It is not unlikely that China may make even larger demands upon our resources.

No one will dispute that the immediate result of an extension of trade with the Orient on these lines will prove profitable to the nation. It cannot fail to stimulate national prosperity, by giving employment to large numbers of workers, who in turn contribute to the general welfare by expending their earnings. But if there is any foundation for the assumption that we are encroaching upon



our irreplaceable resources; if the recent White House conference was not an unnecessary bit of pessimism, then the prosperity which is thus purchased will be of the same sort a dissipated heir enjoys while getting rid of his inheritance without attempting to do anything to replenish his coffers.

It therefore becomes incumbent on statesmen to inquire how much reason there is for believing that our resources are being impaired, and if the conclusion of the conferees at the White House that "the forests which regulate our rivers, support our industries and promote the fertility and productiveness of the soil should be preserved and perpetuated, and that the minerals found so abundantly beneath the surface should be so used as to prolong their utility," is sound, then it is their duty to shape the laws so that these purposes may be accomplished, even if the result is to completely upset the theories of the economists who teach that mankind is benefited by wasteful methods.

In an article such as this it would be impossible to present the evidence that demonstrates the soundness of the assumption that the natural resources are rapidly being dissipated, nor is it necessary to do so, as the papers read by the conferees at the White House are easily accessible. It is sufficient to quote Carnegie's undisputed statement, that our processes of mining and our methods of consuming coal are wasteful, and that our supply of iron ore, at the present rate of consumption, will not last one hundred years.

In 1881 the output of coal in the United States was 85,881,039 short tons; in 1907 it had increased to 488,800,000 tons. The increase in a single year, from 1906 to 1907, was over 90,000,000 tons. A quarter of a century ago the prediction that our output would increase fivefold in twenty-six years would have been deemed preposterous. The assumption that the next twenty-six years will witness a like increase must appear equally incredible, yet failure to keep the pace means an interruption to what we have hitherto considered commercial progress.

The Birkinbine engineering offices of Philadelphia recently issued a chart illustrating the expansion of the pig-iron industry of the United States between 1890 and 1907, which developed the interesting facts that the product had increased from 327 pounds per capita in the first-named year to 675 pounds in 1907, or 106 per cent, and that the price, despite the enormousness of the output, had

greatly increased, both absolutely and relatively, as measured by the currency in circulation. A leading journal, commenting on this presentation, remarked: "The chart shows the phenomenal growth and the great commercial value of our iron industry," and it doubtless voiced the opinion of men of affairs throughout the land; and the judgment would probably be the same if the quantity produced were 60,000,000 or 100,000,000 tons annually, instead of the 27,000,000 tons reached in 1907.

From the standpoint of the economist who deals wholly with the present, the enormously increased output of coal and pig iron must be regarded as beneficial. When a people are able to annually consume 675 pounds per capita of a useful metal like iron, they are apparently in better case than they were when their consumption was less than one-half that quantity. But the benefit is of the most transitory character and more apparent than real. If the output of iron and coal could be indefinitely increased, the benefit would be indisputable, but as they are both limited in quantity and practically irreplaceable, their injudicious use can only be compared with that of a lot of shipwrecked mariners who prodigally consume their store of provisions while adrift on a raft in midocean.

The analogy is complete. So far as the use of iron and coal is concerned, we are proceeding even more insanely than mariners who would improvidently consume their store of provisions when menaced by the possibility of rescue being long deferred, for we have adopted a commercial policy which economists extol, of getting rid of our irreplaceable commodities by selling them to foreigners who, under proper stimulus, could provide themselves from their own stock. To extend the simile of the shipwrecked mariners, our action resembles the inconceivable folly which an insane sailor on the raft would display if he threw part of his bread to the fishes and thus deliberately increased the chance of starvation.

If there is any doubt on this point it will be speedily resolved by studying the import of a demand made upon the Interstate Commerce Commission at one of its recent sittings, where it was shown by the representative of the Harriman lines that unless the trans-continental railroads were permitted to charge a lesser rate for freight dispatched over their lines to the Orient than that exacted from shippers of domestic goods they would not be able to compete with the Suez route, as nearly all the goods shipped to Eastern

Asia via the transcontinental railroads and steamships sailing from Pacific ports of the United States came from the territory east of Chicago and close to the Eastern seaboard.

A large part of our Oriental business is made up of manufactures of iron. The probability of securing a million-ton contract to supply the Siberian railroad with rails of American manufacture has already been noted, and the tables of exports show that we are now shipping large quantities of rails, wire nails, machinery and other iron products to Asiatic countries. We are also exporting considerable quantities of raw cotton by direct and circuitous routes to Eastern Asia.

It is not necessary to state with exactness the extent of the trade already developed. It is, however, of considerable consequence and is a serious factor in the inroads made upon our natural resources, especially those of iron and coal, and incidentally of timber. But if it were insignificant at present, we have to consider the fact that the avowed purpose of the advocates of a revision of the tariff as it relates to Oriental countries is to stimulate to the utmost our export trade to them by the dubious device of admitting their products to this country at lower rates of duty than are exacted at present.

It would be a work of supererogation to point out that a policy of "forcing out" such as that outlined in the proposals of the tariff revisionists to stimulate exports of iron and coal to Asiatic countries is in the highest degree inconsistent with the demand for the conservation of the natural resources of the country. Such a course may temporarily promote prosperity, but the inevitable result will be to hamper future commercial progress by making iron, coal and timber dearer and less accessible to the domestic consumer. The remarks of the author of "Made in Germany," in commenting on the draft made upon the coal measures of the United Kingdom, are applicable to us: "Every ton of coal extracted from our coal fields," he said, "implies a permanent loss of wealth to that amount. The coal doesn't grow again. . . . When you send it away to the foreigner to feed his factories, which destroy or injure your factories and take in return from him foodstuffs, . . . you are letting your land deteriorate."

It is impossible to dispute this; the conclusions of the conservation conference are in perfect accord with the deduction, yet the

disposition exists (and it will probably prevail) to disregard the consequences by continuing the fatuous policy of getting rid of our resources as rapidly as fancied immediate commercial needs demand. In the future, as in the past, the only concern of statesmen will be the present. Any proposition which suggests an impairment of the facilities for converting the natural resources of the country into immediate profit will receive scant courtesy from those who legislate for us and will be derided by the classes whose ideas of national prosperity are bounded by consideration for the immediate present.

I say this in full consciousness of the earnestness of the advocates of conservation, and the apparent progress made by the movement for the protection of the forests and the preservation of the mineral lands still in the possession of the government. The success of the latter is wholly dependent upon the fact that individual interests are not directly involved. The policy of conservation would have achieved success had it been inaugurated three-quarters of a century ago; but now that the major part of the country's forests have disappeared, and nearly all the valuable mineral lands are in the hands of private persons, the almost insuperable difficulty attending regulation when individualism has thoroughly established itself, as it has in the United States, will prove a constant obstacle to consistent efforts to conserve.

Before the world can achieve real economies through conservation, it will be absolutely necessary to destroy the impression that all trade is beneficial to mankind. We shall have to learn to distinguish between that which is economical and that which tends to waste. Protection should have developed this knowledge, but it has failed to do so because its advocates have not clearly perceived that its paramount function was the elimination of waste by bringing consumer and producer as closely together as possible.

There has always been a confusion in the protectionist mind on this latter point, and it is responsible for the vagaries of the advocates of reciprocal trade, whose estimates of the national prosperity are based on the figures of exports and imports, and who have become blinded to the fact that the increasing volume of the latter may indicate growing wastefulness and therefore not productive of a prosperity whose genuineness is evidenced by the permanence of its results.

No rational economist, when the matter is squarely presented  
(358)

to him, will dare to assert that the prosperity of to-day, which will inevitably produce scarcity in the near future, is desirable. To maintain such a position he would have to defend the practices of nomadic savages, with whom life is a feast or a famine. It would seem, then, that every effort and every teaching should be directed to shaping our industrial and commercial energies, so that the elimination of waste shall be the first consideration of statesmen. In short, we should live up to the theories which found expression in the conservation conference.

We can do so in our dealings with the Orient if we frame our tariff schedules with a view to discouraging rather than to encourage the importation from Asiatic countries of products which we may produce ourselves. If we bring ourselves to realize clearly that the forcing out of our irreplaceable products, which results from the feverish desire to exchange them for things which we do not need, or which we could produce ourselves, will invite disastrous consequences in the near future, we shall approach the subject of conservation in the right frame of mind. If, for instance, the generality could or would grasp the fact that the direct or indirect exchange of millions of tons of coal and iron for the products of Asiatic silkworms spells dearer coal and iron not many years hence, the uneconomic character of this branch of Oriental trade would be conceded, and it is typical of the major part of our trade with Asia, and for that matter of most international exchanges.

I am aware that advocacy of a reasonable restriction of trade will be met with the *reductio ad absurdum*. Some one will say: "Why not carry out the theory in this country and stop waste by restricting wasteful trading between the peoples of the various political sub-divisions." The answer is simple enough. In the case of a man who is impairing his health by intemperate eating and drinking, a judicious doctor will warn him to put some restraint on his appetite, but he would hardly make the blunder of advising him to wholly cease eating.

It is plainly apparent that the very things which a consensus of opinion credits with being the great sources of modern prosperity—iron and coal are limited in quantity. Visionaries tell us that when they are all gone the world will find something to take their place. But economists have no right to assume anything of the kind. It is their business to deal with the known resources,

and if they can, to point out how they can be conserved. Something in that direction can be accomplished by a resort to a tariff based wholly on the idea of making the best use of what we have so that there may be something left for the future. We must get rid of the absurd notion that we are benefiting by burning our candle at both ends. We will have to divest ourselves of our pride in a railroad system which consumes millions upon millions of tons of iron and coal annually, and ask ourselves how much of the work it performs represents absolute waste and how much genuine service.

Such an inquiry will have to go a step further than the suggestion embodied in Andrew Carnegie's presentation of the fact that "moving 1,000 tons of freight by rail requires an eighty-ton locomotive and twenty-five twenty-ton steel cars (each of forty-ton capacity), or 580 tons of iron and steel, with an average of, say, ten miles of double track (with ninety-pound rails), or 317 tons additional, so that, including switches, frogs, fish plates, spikes and other incidentals, the carriage requires an equal use of metal," whereas "the same freight may be moved by water by means of 100 to 250 tons of metal, so that the substitution of water carriage for railway carriage would reduce the consumption of iron by three-fourths to seven-eighths in this department, reducing at the same time the consumption of coal for motive power from 50 to 75 per cent, with a corresponding reduction in the coal required for smelting." If we are really in earnest in the matter of conservation we shall endeavor to learn how much of the 21,653,795,696 tons of freight moved one mile in 1906 by the 55,439 locomotives and the nearly 2,000,000 freight, baggage and express cars operated on American railroads was uselessly hauled, and take steps, not merely to reduce the waste by substituting water carriage, but to eliminate it wholly, if possible, by dispensing with unnecessary hauling wherever practicable.

Water carriage is unquestionably cheapest when available, and the fact that we have deliberately neglected our waterways is overwhelming evidence of our prodigality in more ways than one. But those who lay too much stress on the desirability of substituting that method of transportation for the more costly movement of freight by rail are apt to close their eyes to the wasteful features of the former. Ten years ago the writer called attention to a peculiarity of British external trade, by instancing that in 1896 the

exports of coal from the United Kingdom constituted 84.7 per cent of the quantitative volume of the export business of that country during the year named. Or, as the British author from whom the information was derived put it: "Coal enters into practically the whole of our exports and probably forms the cargo of over 50 per cent of the tonnage cleared from the United Kingdom." Since 1896 the exports of coal from the United Kingdom have increased from 44,200,000 tons to 66,063,258, and the bunker coal in 1897 reached 18,618,828 tons.

There is no attempt to dispute the assertion that the exportation of British coal is causing a steady rise of the price of that commodity in Great Britain, nor that the recent export tax on coal was advocated on the ground of conservation, but the British are afraid to look the situation squarely in the face. They have created a condition for themselves which they feel admits of no mending except by a resort to heroic methods, that would involve a sacrifice on the part of the present generation which it is not ready to make. The United States and other new countries, however, are in better case. It is not imperatively demanded of us that we shall exchange our irreplaceable iron and coal and our timber resources for foodstuffs produced by other peoples. We can easily feed and clothe our population, and in accomplishing that result, by bringing consumer and producer closer together, we shall automatically eliminate the waste which ensues when energy and resources are uselessly expended.

While under the hallucination that the world becomes richer by wasting its energies in useless transportation, we listen to the plans of those who foolishly imagine that their country and mankind can be benefited by getting rid of natural resources which cannot be replaced. In the category of such advocates must be placed those who imagine that the exportation of vast quantities of iron and the products of iron to Asiatic countries will contribute to American prosperity. It may temporarily produce that result, but the inevitable outcome of the policy will be future deprivation. We cannot eat our cake and save it at the same time.

The views here expressed may just now seem extreme, and the natural inference from them that the most practicable way of conserving resources is through trade regulations will prove repugnant to the vast number of people who believe absolute freedom of trade

is a promoter of prosperity. The units composing the trading world are now imbued with the idea that the destruction which is profitable to the individual is not only justifiable but beneficial to mankind. The individual owner of forest lands is ready to profit by their denudation, and does not ask what the consequences will be to other than himself. But a state of the public mind is rapidly being created which will not shrink from placing restraints on the owners of timber lands, and this will soon be followed by a like imposition on the owner of iron mines and coal measures. A step in that direction which will not seriously impinge upon the individualistic theory will be the enactment of tariff laws which will have the effect of discouraging exports that involve waste of the natural resources of the country and future scarcity and consequent dearth.